

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT
SUMMARY ORDER

RULINGS BY SUMMARY ORDER DO NOT HAVE PRECEDENTIAL EFFECT. CITATION TO A SUMMARY ORDER FILED ON OR AFTER JANUARY 1, 2007, IS PERMITTED AND IS GOVERNED BY FEDERAL RULE OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE 32.1 AND THIS COURT'S LOCAL RULE 32.1.1. WHEN CITING A SUMMARY ORDER IN A DOCUMENT FILED WITH THIS COURT, A PARTY MUST CITE EITHER THE FEDERAL APPENDIX OR AN ELECTRONIC DATABASE (WITH THE NOTATION "SUMMARY ORDER"). A PARTY CITING A SUMMARY ORDER MUST SERVE A COPY OF IT ON ANY PARTY NOT REPRESENTED BY COUNSEL.

At a stated term of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, held at the Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse, 40 Foley Square, in the City of New York, on the 9th day of February, two thousand sixteen.

PRESENT:

DENNIS JACOBS,
BARRINGTON D. PARKER,
GERARD E. LYNCH,
Circuit Judges.

DOLORES OSWALDO MORALES MEJIA,
Petitioner,

v.

13-1252
NAC

LORETTA E. LYNCH, UNITED STATES
ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Respondent.

FOR PETITIONER: Rahul Chakravartty, Bridgeport, CT.

FOR RESPONDENT: Stuart F. Delery, Assistant Attorney General, Francis W. Fraser, Senior Litigation Counsel, Dawn S. Conrad, Trial Attorney, Office of Immigration Litigation, United States Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

1 UPON DUE CONSIDERATION of this petition for review of a
2 Board of Immigration Appeals ("BIA") decision, it is hereby
3 ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that the petition for review
4 is DENIED.

5 Petitioner Dolores Oswaldo Morales Mejia, a native and
6 citizen of Honduras, seeks review of a March 14, 2013,
7 decision of the BIA denying his motion to reopen. *In re*
8 *Morales Mejia*, No. A029 728 460 (B.I.A. Mar. 14, 2013). We
9 assume the parties' familiarity with the underlying facts
10 and procedural history in this case.

11 We review the BIA's denial of a motion to reopen for
12 abuse of discretion, remaining "mindful that motions to
13 reopen are 'disfavored.'" *Ali v. Gonzales*, 448 F.3d 515,
14 517 (2d Cir. 2006) (quoting *INS v. Doherty*, 502 U.S. 314,
15 322-23 (1992)); *Kaur v. BIA*, 413 F.3d 232, 233 (2d Cir.
16 2005) (per curiam).

17 The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying
18 reopening because Morales failed to submit an application
19 for relief with his motion, as required under the
20 regulations. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(1).

1 For the foregoing reasons, the petition for review is
2 DENIED.

3 FOR THE COURT:
4 Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe, Clerk
5
6